

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 31, 2005 LB 682

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...of filling the vacancy and starting the...putting a person in for the next term.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes. That's what she just shared with me, that you're actually having an election for two purposes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And the question that that raises in my mind, based on the court case she had been referring to, is that the district involved will be without representation for the period of time between August 1 and the general election in November.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: That is correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: State law, if complied with as it exists now, would push that special election very close to the general election. But even if that were the case, the state law I don't think would trump the federal requirements, as laid down by a court. So if in the Trafigant case, 14 days would have been involved with a district not having representation, because a special election was not going to be called.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: But it was a much longer period of time than that, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: And the court said in that decision that it was not a de minimis period of time; that indeed it would...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But I'm sure the court didn't define "de minimis," "de minimis."

SENATOR SCHIMEK: No, it didn't define it actually. I think it kind of left it up to us to try to figure it out.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And if we guess wrong then what we do would be struck down by the courts, and maybe that person who ran during the general election...well, there just would not have been any representation in that district from the time the vacancy occurred until a person was elected to office in